



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/640,687	08/18/2000	Yoshiko Ozaki	Q60493	7100

7590 02/26/2004
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/640,687

Applicant(s)

OZAKI, YOSHIKO

Examiner

(Iraj) Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 6-8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katakura (US patent 5,953,500).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1, Katakura discloses an image output processor CPU for receiving data transmitted from a plurality of data processors connected to the image output processor (1a, 1b, 1d, and 1e) and for outputting the data to a printer 2 having a plurality of sorter bins, the image output processor comprising:

data transmission source identifying means for identifying the transmission source of data transmitted from the data processors; and

sorter bin determining means for determining to which sorter bin to output the data received from the plurality of data processors based on the data transmission source identified by the data transmission source identifying means (column 3, lines 53-67 and column 4, lines 55-61).

Regarding claim 6, Katakura discloses an image output processor as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the sorter bin determining means comprises a sorter bin determining table that associates the data processors connected to the image output processor with the sorter bins in the printer; and the sorter bin determining means references the sorter bin determining table to determine to which sorter bin to output received data based on the data processor identified as the data transmission source by the data transmission source identifying means (column 5, lines 4-21). Mapping of group code which contains modality (transmission source) is viewed as cross referencing between the transmission source and the sorter bin. In cross-referencing it is common to use data tables for the purpose.

Regarding claim 7, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

Regarding claim 8, Katakura discloses an image output processor as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the data transmission source identifying means supports a plurality of communication protocols and executes different types of processes for identifying the data transmission source based on the communication protocol used to transmit the data from the plurality of data processors (column 3, lines 53-67 and column 4, lines 1-6). Katakura discloses the sorting image signal represents information on the object modality and the like. Specification on page 23-24

Art Unit: 2622

states that attribute data is used to select sorter bin. Any of the sorting image signals are considered to be the attributes in selecting a bin.

Regarding claim 10, Katakura discloses an image output processor as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the data processors are medical diagnostic imaging devices 1a, 1b, 1d and 1e.

Regarding claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Regarding claim 12, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6 are applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakura (US patent 5,953,500) in view of Yamada (US patent 6,009,804).

Regarding claim 2, Katakura does not disclose an image output processor as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the image output processor and the plurality of data processors are connected via a network. Yamada discloses in column 3, lines 57-64 plural data processing devices connected to a printer in a LAN. Katakura and Yamada are analogous art because they are from

Art Unit: 2622

the same field of endeavor that is distributing prints to select output bins assigned to a user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to hook up the image output processor and the data processors via a network to allow sharing a printer for printing from remote locations.

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakura (US patent 5,953,500) in view of Yoshida (US patent 5,982,504).

Regarding claim 4, Katakura does not disclose an image output processor as claimed in Claim 3, wherein the data transmission source identifying means identifies the source of data transmission by determining the communication channel used to transmit the data from the plurality of data processors; and the sorter bin determining means determines to which sorter bin to output data received from the plurality of data processors based on the communication channel identified by the data transmission source identifying means. Yoshida discloses in column 3, lines 66-67 and column 4, lines 1-17 that signals 1-5 correspond to select output bins. These signals are detected from the incoming calls to the fax device. The incoming calls are usually routed through different communication channels till is received by the fax device. Katakura and Yoshida are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is sending faxes to designated output bins. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to keep the communication channels separate to ensure secure communication.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 5, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakura (US patent 5,953,500) in view of Lash (US patent application 2001/0020229).

Regarding claim 3, Katakura does not disclose an image output processor as claimed in claim 1, wherein the image output processor and the plurality of data processors are connected via dedicated data communication channels. Lash discloses in column 3, paragraph 35 dedicated communication channels. Katakura and Lash are analogous art because they both teach a network of data processing terminals connected to a printer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use dedicated communication lines to ensure uninterrupted and secure data transmission.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakura (US patent 5,953,500) in view of Barry et al. (US patent 6,657,741).

Regarding claim 9, Katakura does not disclose an image output processor as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the sorter bin determining means executes a process for determining an appropriate printer to use in the output process. Barry discloses in column 2, lines 66-67 and column 3, lines 1-17 discloses use of appropriate printer for the print job. Katakura and Barry are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is multiple print engines connected to plurality of workstations to create print jobs. Therefore, it would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2622

to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use the automatic printer selection method of Barry to remove user from the decision making process.

Other Prior Art Cited

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ohara (US patent 4,789,782) discloses radiation image recording and processing system.

Vance (US patent 5361,085) discloses method and apparatus for printing medical information signals.

Mandel et al. (US patent 5,752,697) discloses remote printing job confidentially.

Nishiwaki (US reissued patent RE37,031) discloses a printer accepting print requests from a plurality of users comprising bins storing printouts.

Nakahira et al. (US patent 6,546,313) discloses a printer having plurality of discharge trays.

Mandel (US patent 5,435,544) discloses sending fax to recipient by means of a code.

Weiser (US patent 5920,404) discloses electronic mail box.

Castro (US patent 6,014,228) discloses electronic mail box.

Kuo (US patent 5,513,013) discloses a facsimile outputting sorted faxes.

Art Unit: 2622

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alan Rahimi
February 18, 2004



EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600